

REMARKS

Claims 6, 13-17, 19-25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,300,679 to Mukerji. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6, as previously presented, includes the features of a form standard that is provided as a rigid mandrel and that is initially disposed above the upper surface of the second CSP, the form standard defining a standard sized form, and a flex circuit that is at least partially disposed about the form standard subsequent to the form standard being disposed above the upper surface of the second CSP, the form standard defining a cross-sectional shape of the flex circuit. As discussed in detail herein, Mukerji fails to disclose at least these features of claim 6. However, and in a genuine effort to advance prosecution of the instant patent application, claim 6 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion on page 13 of the instant Office action. More specifically, claim 6 has been amended to provide that the form standard includes a thermally conductive material.

As discussed in Applicants' previous response, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference, Mukerji fails to disclose a form standard that is provided as a rigid mandrel, much less a form standard that defines a standard sized form defining a cross-sectional shape of the flex circuit. In addressing these features, the Examiner identifies the mask 512 in Fig. 5 of Mukerji as a form standard, and goes on to describe the mask 512 as a rigid mandrel that defines a standardized form and a cross-sectional shape of the flex circuit (see instant Office action, at page 3). Other than Fig. 5, the Examiner has provided no support in Mukerji for the assertion that the mask 512 is a rigid mandrel that defines a standardized form and a cross-sectional shape of the flex circuit. Instead, the Examiner relies on Fig. 5 in a vacuum, without referencing the underlying description thereof.

The mask 512 of Fig. 5, however, taken in context with the underlying description from Mukerji, is provided as an electrically insulating layer that can be applied over traces of a flexible substrate to prevent the traces from directly contacting a semiconductor chip (see col. 4, lines 16-22). Mukerji goes on to explicitly provide that the mask layer is applied over the traces before bending or folding of the substrate (see col. 4, lines 22-24). Consequently, the mask layer must also be flexible in order to subsequently bend or fold with the substrate.

Taking Fig. 5 in context with the literal description of Mukerji, the mask layer 512 cannot reasonably be described as a rigid mandrel that defines a standardized form and a cross-sectional shape of the flex circuit. As noted above, Mukerji requires the mask layer to be flexible and to be applied to the substrate before bending or folding of the substrate. Consequently, Mukerji fails to disclose at least the above-described, previously presented features of claim 6.

Mukerji also fails to disclose the above-described amended feature of claim 6. More specifically, Mukerji fails to describe a form standard that includes a thermally conductive material. The mask layer of Mukerji, which the Examiner has identified as a form standard, is electrically insulating and is merely described as comprising "conventional masking materials" (see col. 4, lines 22-24). Consequently, Mukerji also fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 6.

In view of the foregoing, Mukerji does not disclose. Consequently, Mukerji fails to describe each and every element as set forth in claim 6, and does not disclose the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 6, as required when applying a reference under §102(b). Therefore, reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13-17, 19-25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukerji in view of Karabatsos. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of claims 13-17, 19-25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 ultimately depends from claim 6, which defines over the asserted reference, as discussed in detail above. Consequently, each of claims

13-17, 19-25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 also define over the asserted reference for at least the same reasons. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reason for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to amendment. Applicants respectfully request consideration of all filed IDS' not previously considered, by initialing and returning each Form 1449.

Applicants request a one-month extension of time. All fees are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 21260-0021001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 8, 2008



Ryan McCarthy
Reg. No. 50,636

Fish & Richardson P.C.
One Congress Plaza, Suite 810
111 Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone: (512) 472-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945